

The effect of private language institutes on high school students' final exam performance

Mahmood Safari ^{*1}, Abolfazl Shafei²

¹Hazrat Masoumeh University, Iran; ²Payam Noor University, Iran

*E-mail: dr.mahmood.safari@gmail.com

Received for publication: 14 June 2017.

Accepted for publication: 26 September 2017.

Abstract

The present research investigated the effect of attending private language institutes on Iranian high school students' performance on English final exams. The participants of the study were 160 high school students, eighty of whom had attended private language institutes. The performance of the students who had attended English institutes on high school English final exam was compared to that of the students who had not attended private institutes. The analysis of their English final scores revealed that attending private institutes had no significant effect on the final-exam performance of the students, there was no significant difference between male and female students in their final-exam performance, and there was no significant relationship between the length of study at private institutes and performance on English final exams. However, further investigations revealed that the high school and private institutes' textbooks, teaching methodologies and final exams are different. Private institutes focus on communicative ability and oral skills, while the focus of high school is on grammar, vocabulary and reading. The study implies that high school textbooks, teaching method and final exams must be more communicative and include more oral/aural activities.

Keywords: Private language institutes, high school English, final-exam performance

Introduction

The importance of the ability to communicate in English to play an active role in global economy, politics and education is well known for everybody. However, despite the pivotal role of English language as the lingua franca of the world communication, trade, and science, educational systems in some countries, including Iran, have not been successful in training students who can communicate in English (Farhady, 1999). Many well-educated people are not sufficiently able to interact with their foreign colleagues in international conventions and have problem publishing articles in international journals despite their profound technical knowledge. Most people believe that high school English courses do not prepare them for communication in English. Moreover, some studies evaluating high school English textbooks and teaching methodology have indicated that they are not appropriate for training students to communicate in English appropriately (e.g., Ansary & Babaii, 2002; Golpour, 2012; Jahangard, 2007; Keihaniyan, 2011; Namaghi, 2006; Razmjoo, 2007; Riazi & Razmjoo, 2006; Shabani & Mansoori Nejad, 2013; Yarmohammadi, 2002). They have mainly revealed that high school English textbooks do not present English communicatively and activities are far from being communicative.

However, private English institutes seem to have been more effective in helping language learners to achieve communicative ability. The very fact that many high school and university students turn to private language institutes to improve their communication ability indicates that Iranian high school system has not been as effective in teaching communicative English as the private sector. High school English textbooks mainly focus on grammar points, which are explicitly

explained by the teacher and practiced through repetition drills, such as chain and substitution drills and teachers translate dialogues and reading passages. The teaching methodology in private institutes and their employed textbooks (e.g., Top Notch and New Interchange) are more communicative and institute class activities (e.g., discussion and essay writing) include more real communication (Riazi & Razmjoo, 2006). Most exercises in these textbooks are pair-work or group-work activities, which require learners to interact with their classmates and communicate their ideas or intentions. This prepares them for real communication outside classroom. So many students attend language institutes to learn how to communicate in English. Moreover, most people believe that language institutes can help students to improve their scores on English final exams at high school. Therefore, many students attend English courses at private institute hoping that they will be able to enhance their scores at high school English exams.

The present study attempts to investigate the effect of attending English courses at private institutes on high school students' performance on English final exams. Research has mainly indicated that learners' previous language knowledge and experience positively influence their future language learning and second language mastery (e.g., Cummins, 1978; Half & Frisbie, 1977; Lange et al., 1992; Wiley, 1985), though a few studies have rejected the effect of previous knowledge and experience on learning a second language (Al-Jasser, 1983; Omari & Zughoul, 1986; Shafie, 2005). Attending private institutes is supposed to provide learners with previous language knowledge and experience, which can affect their language achievement and their performance on English final exams at high school. Students who attend language institutes are expected to perform significantly better than those not attending institutes on high school English exams; however, the discrepancy in the contents of high school and institute textbooks and final exams might render the effect of institute instructions on high school exams insignificant.

To investigate the effect of attending language institutes on students' performance on high school English exams, the following research questions were put forth and for each question a null hypothesis was assumed.

- 1- Is there any significant difference in the performance of Iranian third-grade junior high school students attending language institutes and those not attending institutes on English final exams?
- 2- Is there any significant relationship between the length (i.e., the number of terms) of study at private language institutes and the final exam performance of third-grade junior high school students?
- 3- Is there any significant difference in the performance of male and female third-grade high school students on English final exams?

Literature Review

Effect of previous knowledge

The ability to acquire a new language is affected by an individuals' past language knowledge and experience (Ellis, 2008; as cited in Chan, 2014). Most scholars believe that learners' achievement at school depends on their previous knowledge and experiences (e.g., Breen, 1989; Cummins, 1978; Gregory & Parry, 2006; Mayer, 2008; Shapiro, 2004; Seifert, 2007; Strevens, 1978). According to Cooper (1993), previous knowledge comprises an individual's all previous learning and experiences that have occurred before the new learning. Cummins' Interdependency Principle states that language achievement in class is to a great extent dependent on learners' previous language learning experience. Breen believed that previous knowledge and capability is a basis for new language learning and learned materials can assist acquisition of new language knowledge. Research has mainly shown that previous language knowledge and experience

considerably affect learners' new language acquisition (Half & Frisbie, 1977; Leung & Williams, 2013; Lange, Sims & Prior, 1992; Wiley, 1985; Zarei, 1996; Young, 1991). Zarei indicated that Iranian English majors' general English proficiency at their arrival in university had a positive significant relationship with their final language achievement. Half and Frisbie noticed that foreign language students' scores on first year language exams had a positive relationship with their scores at high school. Elder (1996) found that "language background had a marked effect on foreign language test performance, at least in the early stages of foreign language learning" (p. 3). Johnston (1992) indicated that background knowledge enhances the learners' listening ability to make inferences during information processing. Nevertheless, there have been some studies which rejected the effect of previous knowledge and experience on language learning (Al-Jasser, 1983; Omari & Zughoul, 1986; Shafie, 2005). Omari and Zughoul showed that students' scores on high school English tests had no weighty power to predict their English language success at the university level.

Gender and language learning

Research on the effect of gender on language learning has produced mixed and inconclusive results. While many studies have shown that females are better language learners (e.g., Boyle, 1987; Farhady, 1980; Nyikos, 1990; Zarei, 1996), other studies have suggested that males are better learners or there is no difference between males and females (e.g., Grass, 1992, cited in Bacon, 1992; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998; Spurling & Illyin, 1985; Young, 1991). Boyle noticed that female EFL students outperformed males on ten tests of general English proficiency and in Nyikos' study, female learners outperformed males in a German vocabulary memorization task. But in Scarcella and Zimmerman's research, male students outscored their female classmates in the knowledge of academic vocabulary. Investigating students' final exam results, Chastain (1988) realized that females were more effective on written skills and males were better on spoken skills. Finally, Bacon found no difference between females and males on two tests of listening vocabulary.

Language instruction in Iran

In Iran, as most countries in the world, English is the major foreign language which is formally instructed. It is taught at high school as a required course and in language institutes as a voluntary activity. Language teaching at Iranian high schools is a mixture of Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and Audiolingual Method (ALM), which includes translation of lesson dialogues and reading comprehension passages, explanation of grammar points, repetition drills such as substitution and transformation drills, unscrambling sentences.

High school English textbooks have been evaluated by many researchers, many of whom have concluded that the books are not appropriate for teaching students how to communicate in English (e.g., Amerian, 1987; Ansary & Babaii, 2002; Dahmardeh, 2009; Golpour, 2012; Jahangard, 2007; Namaghi, 2006; Yarmohammadi, 2002; Zohrabi, Sabouri & Behroozian, 2012). The major focus of the textbooks is on grammar, vocabulary and reading skill. According to Jahangard (2007), grammar has the lion share in the high school English textbooks.

High school English final exams, too, have been shown to be inappropriate. The negative washback effects of the exams have been identified as one the major reasons for the ineffective instruction of English at high schools (Ghorbani, 2009; Namaghi, 2006; Mokhtary & Moradi, 2013). Aural/oral skills are missing and the tests do not measure communication ability of students. Mokhtary and Moradi (2013), through observation of English classes at high school and interviewing teachers, indicated that school-leaving tests of English have a negative washback effect on teachers' practice of language teaching in Iranian high schools.

Language teaching in Iranian private institutes mainly follows communicative approach to language teaching. Most of the activities performed by learners in classroom or as homework (e.g.,

discussing a topic or writing about a personal experience) contain some type of real communication. Also, writing and oral skills have their own share in institute textbooks and class activities. The textbooks commonly used in language institutes (e.g., *Headway*, *Interchange series*, *Top Notch*) are mainly based on the principles of CLT. Richards (as cited in Razmjoo, 2006), mentioning CLT principles, states that Interchange is based on Communicative Approach. And, using Litz's (2005) textbook evaluation form, Soleimani and Ghaderi (2013) indicated that teachers were satisfied with *Interchange Series* and *American English File*.

Some studies have compared language teaching at Iranian high schools and private institutes and have shown that private institutes are more effective and follow principles of communicative language teaching to a greater extent (e.g., Keihaniyan, 2011; Pazhouhesh, 2014; Razmjoo, 2007; Riazi & Razmjoo, 2006). Keihaniyan revealed that in high schools, the teacher has a central role while learners have a passive role, instructional materials are merely text-based and activities are mainly imitation drills; however, in private institutes, the teacher is a facilitator/counselor, learners have an active role, materials and activities are more communicative and all language skills are practiced. Jalali Zad (2013), comparing classroom processes in high school and private institutes, indicated that using task-based (compared to form-based) verbal interaction was higher in private institutes.

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the study were 160 third-grade junior high school students in the city of Delijan in Iran, who were randomly selected from among the approximately 600 students in the city. The participants were eighty female students and eighty male students in the 14-16 age range. Eighty participants (40 males and 40 females) had attended private English institutes in Delijan for one to ten terms (4.25 terms on average) and eighty (40 males and 40 females) had never attended private language institutes. The students who had attended private language institutes formed the experimental group of the study and those who had not attended private institutes formed the control group. Table 1 displays the information about the participants.

Table 1: Descriptive information about the participants of the study

	Females	Males	Total
Experimental group	40	40	80
Control group	40	40	80
Total	80	80	160

Instruments

The single instrument of the study was a questionnaire which collected information about the participants' attendance or non-attendance at private English institutes, the number of terms they attended the institutes and their scores on the third-grade junior high school English final exam. The final exam scores of the students were checked in the official documents of their high schools to ensure their accuracy.

Data collection procedure

The participants answered the questions in the questionnaire before they took their English final exam. Then their responses, which formed the research data, were analyzed to find out the effect of attending private language institutes and gender on the performance of the students on the

final exam. Subsequently, lesson one in junior high school English textbook and unit one in New Interchange, Intro (Richards, 1998), which are almost at the same instructional level, were investigated and compared. They were investigated in terms of the types of activities (repetition drills versus communicative tasks) which were most often used in the textbooks and the frequency of activity types in each textbook.

Data analysis

Data analysis of the study was carried out using two statistical measures, namely independent samples t-test and Pearson correlation analyses. The t-test compared the students who had attended English private institutes and those who had never attended language institutes and male and female students in terms of their performance on English final exam. The Pearson correlation was used to investigate the relationship between the students' performance on the English final exam and the number of terms they attended private language institutes. Descriptive analysis and frequency counts were used to analyze and compare activity and presentation types in the high school and Intro textbooks.

Results

To investigate the effect of attending private language institutes on the students' performance on English final exam, an independent samples t-test was carried out on the students' scores. Table 2 displays the descriptive statistics of the two groups' final exam performance. As the table indicates, there was a difference in the performance of the students who had attended private language institutes (experimental group) and those who had not (control group), the students attending private institutes performing better on the test.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	80	16.40	1.34	.15
Control	80	16.32	1.13	.12

However, an independent samples t-test was required to ascertain whether the difference was statistically significant or not. Table 3 displays the results of the t-test analysis. As it is shown, the p value ($\text{Sig} = .681$) exceeds the critical .5, which indicates that the mean difference between the experimental and control groups (mean difference = .08) was not statistically significant and their performance on the exam was identical. So the first null hypothesis (i.e., there is no significant difference in the performance of Iranian third-grade junior high school students attending language institutes and those not attending institutes on English final exams.) was confirmed and it was shown that attending private language institutes has no significant effect on final exam performance of high school students.

Table 3: T-test analysis of the groups' English exam scores

Equal variances assumed	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference
	.412	158	.681	.08

To explore the relationship between the length of study at private language institutes (i.e., the number of terms the students attended private institutes) and performance on English final exam, a Pearson correlation analysis was performed on the scores of the students who had attended language institutes and the number of terms they had attended institutes (Table 3). The analysis was aimed to investigate whether the students who attend more terms in private institutes perform better on high

school English final exam. The results indicated that there is no significant relationship between the length of study at private institutes and high school final exam scores. As the table 4 displays, the p value (Sig = .128) exceeds critical .5 and reveals no significant correlation between length of study at institutes and final exam scores. A second Pearson correlation analysis performed on the scores of all the participants (i.e., both the students who had attended private institutes and those who had not) revealed the same results ($r_{xy} = .054$, $p = .496$, $N = 160$).

Table 4: Pearson correlations analysis

	Scores	Terms
Pearson Correlation	1	.172
Sig. (2-tailed)		.128
N	80	

Therefore, the second null hypothesis (i.e., there is no significant relationship between the length of study at private language institutes and the final exam performance of Iranian third-grade junior high school students) was confirmed and the length (i.e., number of terms) of attending English institutes was shown to have no relationship with students' performance on high school English exam. The length of study at institutes did not have a significant power to predict the performance of the students on English final exam.

Finally, to investigate the effect of gender on students' final-exam performance, an independent samples t-test was carried out on the male and female students' scores. Table 5 shows the descriptive statistics of the male and female students' final exam performance. As it is shown, female students performed slightly better than the male students.

Table 5: Descriptive statistics of the male and female students

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental	80	16.42	1.25
Control	80	16.30	1.23

However, the results of the t-test analysis ($t = .603$, $p = .547$) revealed that the mean difference was not statistically significant and the performances of the male and female students were identical (Table 6). Thus, the third null hypothesis (i.e., There is no significant difference in the performance of male and female third-grade high school students on English final exams.) was confirmed and the third research question was answered. The results suggest that gender has no significant effect on students' English final exam performance.

Table 6: T-test analysis of the male and female students' scores

Equal variances assumed	t	df	Sig.	Mean Difference
	.603	158	.547	.12

The descriptive analysis of the first lesson in the third-grade junior high school English textbook and unit one in New Interchange (Intro) indicated that the former mainly included repetition and substitution drills, where the students were asked to repeat some sentences, following a model, but the latter was more communicative and required students to interact and communicate their intentions, thoughts, ideas or real facts about them. Table 7 shows the types of activities and their frequency in the two textbooks (see Appendix A and B).

Table 7: Frequency of activity types in the two textbooks

Activity types	High school textbook (lesson one)	Intro textbook (unit one)
Repetition drills	7	0
Display questions	5	0
Information questions	0	3
Pair-works	0	4
Group-works	0	4
Personal questions	0	2
Role plays	0	1
Formulae	0	2

As the table indicates, in the high school textbook the activities were mainly repetition drills and display questions which asked students to follow an example model to produce language, whereas, in Intro textbook the activities (e.g., group-work, pair-works, role plays) asked the learners to interact with their classmates and communicate their own messages, thoughts, and ideas and facts about themselves.

The high school textbook started with a dialogue, which did not look authentic, interesting, and useful. Students are less likely to use these sentences in the future. The dialogue was followed by some uninteresting questions. The listening section asked the students to listen and repeat. There was no purpose for the listening activity and students may ignore the activity. Next, a grammar point was presented (possessive -'s) but it was not followed by any activity. Then almost all the subsequent activities were repetition and substitution drills and display questions. Oral drills asked students to repeat the model sentence replacing one word. Writing activities included rewriting a model sentence replacing one part, combining two short sentences following a model, and completing sentences by adding the names of things in the pictures. There was a scrambled sentences activity. Speak out section required students to answer some display questions following a model. Finally, an uncommunicative uninteresting reading passage was included (see Appendix A). Unit one in Intro textbook, started with a list of popular names in the USA, which was followed by some personal and information questions. Then the dialogue appeared and the following pair-work activity presented English alphabets and required the students to ask the names of their classmates and their spellings. Then a grammar point was presented and practiced in some game. The listening activity was followed by a pair-work, where students asked their partners some information questions. Some more group-works were included. Then there was a role-play activity, where a customer asked a telephone director some people's phone numbers. Each student knew just one part of the information. Finally, some prefabricated expressions of formulae (saying hello and goodbye) were presented and practiced in pair-works and group-works (see Appendix B).

Discussion

The independent samples t-test comparing the final exam performance of the students who had attended private language institutes and those who had not attended institutes revealed that there was no significant difference between them; that is, the students attending institutes did not perform better than the other students. And the Pearson Correlation analysis indicated that there was no significant relationship between the length (i.e., the number of terms) of study at institutes and final exam performance of the third-grade junior high school students.

Research has mainly shown that previous language knowledge and experience has a positive effect new language learning (e.g., Half & Frisbie, 1977; Leung & Williams, 2013; Zarei, 1996).

Attending private language institutes was supposed to have brought about previous language knowledge and experience for learners and accordingly have enhanced their language achievement at high school and their performance on the final exam of English. However, the findings of the present research did not approve of this effect and indicated that previous language experience has almost no effect on language learning. The study results do not confirm the findings of the studies which revealed a positive effect for previous language experience on language learning (e.g., Half & Frisbie, 1977; Leung & Williams, 2013; Lange, Sims & Prior, 1992; Wiley, 1985; Zarei, 1996; and Young, 1991). On the contrary, the results of the study are in line with the findings of the studies by Al-Jasser (1983); Omari & Zughouli (1986); and Shafie (2005), which revealed no effect for previous language knowledge and experience. Al-Jasser concluded that "the differential degree of the English language learning exposure that the students experience at the high school level does not determine or even affect their English language performance at the college level" (p. 51). The correspondence between the findings of the present study and the studies by the Saudi Arabian researchers (Al-Jasser, 1983; Omari & Zughouli, 1986) might be justifiable considering the similar teaching context (i.e., EFL context rather than ESL context) and employed language teaching methodology in Iran and Saudi Arabia. As it was described in the Literature Review section, in Iranian high schools GTM and ALM teaching methods are adopted and language teaching and testing does not follow communicative approach. Likewise, according to Fareh (2010), most teachers in the Arab world adopt Grammar Translation Method and do not follow the principles of communicative language teaching. Language skills are not integrated and are taught separately in a fragmented approach in teacher-centered classes.

The findings of the present study represent the inconsistency between Iranian high school English language curriculum and English programs at private language institutes. The findings are justifiable considering the inconsistency between the two sectors in terms of their English textbooks and teaching methodology. Since the content of the textbooks and teaching and testing approaches in high school and private institutes are different, we cannot expect attending private institutes to significantly affect language achievement and final exam performance of students at high school. High schools mainly follow a mixture of GTM and ALM while institutes attempt to adopt a communicative approach (Keihaniyan, 2011; Riazi & Razmjoo, 2006). Class activities in high school English courses are mainly dialogue and text translation, grammar explanation, and repetition drills, while English institutes mainly involve discussion, writing, listening, and problem-solving activities. The content of the textbooks in the two sectors are different too (Razmjoo, 2007). Institute textbooks involve all language skills and keep a balance among them and the exercises integrate skills and engage learners in communicative activities. However, high school textbooks focus on grammar drills, vocabulary and reading, while paying less attention to listening, writing and speaking skills. The same linguistic features are focused on in high school English final exams, which are evaluated in a discrete-point approach rather than in an integrative communicative approach. The investigation and comparison of lesson one in third-grade junior high school English textbook and unit one in New Interchange, Intro (Richards, 1998) in the present study provided further evidence for this discrepancy. The investigations revealed that the high school textbook mainly includes repetition and substitution drills and display questions, which are far from communicative activities, whereas Intro textbook constitutes pair work, group work, task completion activities and information questions, which exemplify communicative activities and more effectively prepare learners for real communication (Appendix A and B). Moreover, final exams in language institutes entail communicative activities like writing an essay, answering personal and information questions, while questions in high school English exams mainly require recognition of correct words and sentences by the students and answering display questions.

English language programs in the Arab world have similar characteristics and result in similar consequences. Language teaching is teacher-centered and not communicative; textbooks are inappropriate; teachers adopt a Grammar Translation Method, and English tests have a fixed format and ignore aural/oral skills, which results in students' not learning English properly (Fareh, 2010).

Finally, the independent samples t-test comparing the male and female students' scores revealed that gender had no significant effect on students' performance on English final exam. Thus, the results of the present study are in line with the findings of the studies which revealed no significant difference between male and female learners in terms of language learning (e.g., Bacon, 1992; Spurling & Illyin, 1985; Young, 1991) and rejects the results of the studies which indicated that females are better language learners (Boyle, 1987; Farhady, 1980; Nyikos, 1990; Zarei, 1996) and the studies which suggested that male students are better learners of language (e.g., Grass, 1992, cited in Bacon, 1992; Scarcella & Zimmerman, 1998).

Pedagogical implications and further research

The findings of the study have some implications for Iranian Education policy makers, high school English materials developers, and language teachers. First, the study implies that the education system in Iran should improve the quality of language teaching at high school. The objectives of language teaching should be modified to include instruction of all language skills. Also, language teaching methodology must be modified to involve more communicative activities, such as discussion, essay writing, and real tasks. Language skills should not be taught in a fragmented approach through grammar explanation, translation, and repetition drills. Rather, skills ought to be taught in an integrative, interactive and communicative approach, where learners use different skills and interact with the text, other learners and the teacher to perform a task as in real life language use. And more time is required to be allocated for language teaching at high school. According to Riazi and Razmjoo (2006), only two to three hours a week is allotted for the instruction of English at high school, while institutes offer 4-6 hours of instruction a week. More hours of English instruction will result in more efficient language presentation and practice and thus more effective learning. The implication of the study for materials developers is that they should revise the high school English textbooks to include and keep a balance among all language skills and components rather than limiting them to certain components and skills. Moreover, the textbook should present skills in an interactive and communicative approach. Textbook activities can engage students in communicative actions and task performance in addition to or instead of repetition drills and stating grammar rules. An instruction manual should be developed to guide teachers in how to teach the textbooks. Finally, English final exam scheme has to be revised to be more communicative and to evaluate students' aural/oral and writing skills as well. As high stake tests, such as final exam and University Entrance Exam, are certain to have washback effect on language teachers' practice and determine the type of instruction employed by teachers, if final exams require communicative ability on the part of students, teachers will use more communicative and interactive language teaching approaches to prepare the students for the exam.

Like most research studies, the present study had certain limitations and further research is required to overcome these limitations and broaden the scope of research. First, as the research was limited to a single city in Iran (Delijan), interested researchers can replicate the study in other parts of the country to broaden the scope of the study and provide more evidence to confirm the study results and increase the generalizability of the findings or challenge the research results. Further research is also required to investigate the effect of attending language institutes on the performance of high school students at other educational levels (e.g., senior high school students). Interested researchers can also investigate the effect of attending language institutes on students' performance

on other English exams, such as University Entrance Exam and general English exams at university level. Researchers can compare individual language institutes in terms of their English textbooks and teaching methods and their effect on final exam performance of high school students. Finally, researchers can explore the effects of other learner variables, such as motivation, age, and intelligence, on high school students' second language acquisition and their performance on English exams.

Conclusion

The present study explored the effect of private language institutes and gender on Iranian third-grade junior high school students' performance on English final exam and indicated that neither attending language schools nor gender have any significant effect on students' performance. However, the investigations of English textbooks and teaching methodology in private institutes and high school revealed a discrepancy between them. Unlike institute materials and instructors, high school English textbooks and teachers do not follow the principles of communicative language teaching and interactive instruction. The high school textbooks do not involve communicative activities like pair-work, group-work and role play activities, and do not result in students' communication ability. The research findings suggest that high school English textbooks and teaching methods should be revised in order to be more communicative and interactive.

References

- Al-Jasser, J. A. (1983). *Comparative effect of native English-speaking instructors and Nonnative English-speaking instructors on performance of the freshman students at King Saudi University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Kansas.
- Amerian, M. (1987). *A comparative study of the graded English and the Right Pass to English Series, with regard to content and methodology*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
- Ansary, H., & Babaii, E. (2002). Universal characteristics of EFL/ESL textbook: A step towards systematic textbook evaluation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 2, 1-8. Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Ansary-Textbooks/>.
- Bacon, S.M. (1992). The relationship between gender, comprehension, processing strategies and cognitive and affective response in FL listening. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76 (1), 161-176.
- Birjandi, P. & Soheili, A. (2011). English: *Third-grade junior high school*. Tehran: Iran Educational Textbooks Publication.
- Boyle, J. (1987). Sex differences in listening vocabulary. *Language Learning*, 37, 273-284.
- Breen, M. (1989). The social context for language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 156-174.
- Chan, S. (2014). The effects of prior language knowledge in Japanese acquisition as a foreign language: The case of the Japanese noun modifier No. *New Voices*, 6(1), 27-50.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice (3rd ed.)*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace.
- Cooper, D. J. (1993). *Literacy: Helping children construct meaning (2nd edition)*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cummins, J. (1978). Educational implication of mother tongue maintenance in minority language groups. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 395-416.
- Dahmardeh, M. (2009). Communicative textbooks: English language textbooks in Iranian secondary school. *Linguistik Online*, 40 (4).

- Elder, C. (1996). The effect of language background on “foreign” language test performance: The case of Chinese, Italian, and Modern Greek. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 233-282.
- Fareh, Sh. (2010). Challenges of teaching English in the Arab world: Why can't EFL programs deliver as expected? *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 3600–3604.
- Farhady, H. (1980). *Justification, development, and validation of functional language testing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Farhady, H. (1999). Language teaching in Iran. *Roshd Foreign Language Teaching Journal*, 55, 4-6.
- Ghorbani, M. R. (2009). ELT in Iranian high schools in Iran, Malaysia and Japan: Reflections on how tests influence use of prescribed textbooks. *Reflections on English Language Teaching*, 8 (2), 131–139.
- Golpour, F. (2012). Iranian junior high school English book series (Right Path to English) weighted against material evaluation checklists. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 1 (7), 170-179.
- Gregory, G. H., & Parry, T. (2006). *Designing Brain-Compatible learning (3rd edition)*. California: Corwin Press.
- Half, N. F., & Frisbie, D. A. (1977). College foreign language study related to high school foreign language study. *The Modern Language Journal*, 61, 401-406.
- Jahangard, A. (2007). Evaluating of EFL materials taught at Iranian public high schools. *Asian EFL journal*, 9 (2), 130-150.
- Jalali Zad, F. (2013). A comparative study of classroom processes in Iranian high school and private English institute. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 3 (6), 1027-1037.
- Javanmehr, R. (2013). Post-use evaluation of English Book 2 for its effectiveness in Iranian high schools. *Journal of Academic and Applied Studies*, 3 (8), 22-31.
- Johnston, J. S. (1992). Critical period effects in second language acquisition: The effect of written versus auditory materials on competence. *Language Learning*, 42 (2), 217-248.
- Keihaniyan, M. (2011). Teaching Methodology and Motivation: Comparison of Iranian English Private Institute and High School. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2 (3), 588-599.
- Lange, D., Sims, W., & Prior, P. (1992). Prior instruction, equivalency formulas, and functional proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 76 (2), 285-295.
- [Leung, J. H. C.](#), & [Williams, J. N.](#) (2013). Prior linguistic knowledge influences implicit language learning. *The 35th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society (CogSc, 2013), Berlin, Germany.*
- Litz, D. R. A. (2005). Textbook evaluation and ELT management: a South Korean case study. *Asian EFL Journal*, 48 (1), 1–53.
- Mayer, R. E. (2008). *Learning and instruction. (2nd edition)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Mokhtary, A. & Moradi, M. (2013). Examining the influence of the Iranian school leaving test of English (ISLTE) on the teachers' perceptions and performances. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5 (2), 1-23.
- Namaghi, O. S. A. (2006). Forces steering Iranian language teachers' work: A grounded theory. *The Reading Matrix*, 6 (2), 90-105.
- Nyikos, M. (1990). Sex-related differences in adult language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 47(3), 570-582.
- Omari, K. & Zughoul, M. (1986). *Towards formulating an educational administration policy for English majors at Arab universities: A case study*. Research report, ERIC Number: ED 271947.

- Pazhouhesh, M. (2014). Teaching English in state-run and private language schools in Iran: Approaches, designs and procedures. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 5 (1), 43-56.
- Razmjoo, S. A. (2007). High schools or private institutes textbooks? Which fulfill communicative language teaching principles in the Iranian context? *Asian EFL Journal*, 9 (2), 126-140.
- Riazi, A. M. & Razmjoo, A. (2006). Do high schools or private institutes practice communicative language teaching? A case study of Shiraz teachers in high schools and institutes. *The Reading Matrix*, 6 (3), 340-363.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). *Interchange (INTRO): English for international communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scarcella, R. & Zimmerman, C. (1998). Academic words and gender: ESL student performance on a test of academic lexicon. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20 (1), 27-49.
- Seifert, K. (2007). *Contemporary educational psychology*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Shabani, M. B. & Mansoori Nejad, A. (2013). An evaluation of the third-grade high school English textbook: An Iranian case study. *Journal of Studies in Social Sciences*, 2 (1), 67-80.
- Shafie, A. (2005). *The effect of the age of starting language acquisition and gender on language learning of junior and senior third-grade high school students in Delijan City*. A Research Plan for the Research Center of Education Ministry in Markazi Province.
- Shapiro, A. M. (2004) How including prior knowledge as a subject variable may change outcomes of learning research. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 159-189.
- Soleimani, H., & Ghaderi, E. (2013). Do language teachers think about Interchange and American English File? Teacher's evaluation of two ESL textbooks in Iran. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2 (5), 42-50.
- Spurling, S. & Illyin, D. (1985). The impact of learner variables on language test performance. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19 (2), 283-301.
- Stevens, P. (1978). *New orientations in the teaching of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiley, P. D. (1985). A model Flex (foreign language experience) program of the elementary school. *A paper presented at the International Conference on Second/Foreign Language Acquisition by Children, Oklahoma City, OK, March*.
- Yarmohammadi, L. (2002). The evaluation of pre-university textbooks. The Newsletter of the Iranian Academy of Science, 18, pp. 70-87.
- Young, D. J. (1991). Activating student background knowledge in a take charge approach to foreign language reading. *Hispania*, 74 (4), 1124-1133.
- Zarei, A. (1996). *The role of age, sex and prior instruction in foreign language achievement*. Unpublished M.A thesis, Esfahan University.
- Zohrabi, M., Sabouri, H., & Behroozian, R. (2012). An evaluation of merits and demerits of Iranian first year high school English textbook. *English Language Teaching*, 5 (8), 14-22.

Appendices:

Appendix A: Lesson one samples, high school English textbook



Patterns: *Listen and repeat.*

A)

Zahra is a young girl, but her father is an old man.
 She is short, but her brother is tall.
 She is thin, but her sister is fat.
 She has brown eyes, but her brother has black eyes.
 She has a brown dress, but her sister has a black one.



Oral Drills

Close your books. Listen to the speaker and substitute the words in the pattern sentences.*

A.

This is a blue book.

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. large | 4. hard |
| 2. small | 5. blue |
| 3. easy | 6. green |



Write It Down

B. Make new sentences.

Example: It is a class. It is small. It is a small class.

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Mr Hamidi is a teacher. He is young. | -----. |
| 2. This is a house. It is big. | -----. |
| 3. Mrs Amini is a woman. She is old. | -----. |



A. Look at these pictures. Ask questions and give answers. Follow the model.

Model: old woman - in the room:

A: Do you see an old woman in the
 B: Yes, I see an old woman in the



room? room.



1. old bus - in the street

A: -----?
 B: Yes, -----.



2. young thin girls - in the picture

A: -----?
 B: Yes, -----.

Appendix B: Example parts in Unit one, New Interchange (INTRO)

1 Hello. My name is Jennifer Wan.

1] SNAPSHOT

POPULAR FIRST NAMES IN THE U.S.A.

Females		Males	
Jennifer	Sarah	Michael	John
Nicole	Deborah	Robert	Brian
Lisa	Mary	David	William
Michelle	Katherine	James	Steven
Linda	Jessica	Christopher	Matthew




Complete the information.

My favorite girl's name in English:

My favorite boy's name in English:

A popular first name in my country:

1


3] THE ALPHABET 

1 Listen and practice.




A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z
a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z

2 *Pair work* Spell your name. Then find out your partner's name and your teacher's name. Spell their names.

1

5] LISTENING 


1 Who are they? Listen to the conversations. Spell their last names.

a) Whitney (She's a singer.) b) Jackie (He's a movie star.) c) Steven (He's a film director.)

2 *Pair work* Cover the names. Now ask about each person.




A: What's her (his) name?
B: ...
A: How do you spell her (his) name?
B: ...

1 **8] NUMBERS** 

1 Listen and practice.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
zero (oh) one two three four five six seven eight nine ten

2 Say these numbers.

3 Group work Make a list of the names and telephone numbers in your group.

A: What's your telephone number?
B: It's 555-2916.


1 **Interchange 1] Directory Assistance – STUDENT A**


Role play

1 You need the telephone numbers of these people. Student B is the telephone operator. You are the customer. Follow the conversation:

	number
Ms. Kumiko Roku
Ms. Ada Rodrigues
Mr. Marc Rudolph
Mr. Paul Rosen

Operator: Directory Assistance.
Customer: I need the number of
Operator: How do you spell the last name?
Customer:
Operator: And the first name?
Customer:
Operator: Thank you. The number is



1 **9] LISTENING** 

Victor is making a list of telephone numbers of students in his class. He's talking to Sarah Smith. Listen and write the numbers.

Name	Telephone number
David Bloom	
Steven Carlson	555-9173
Nicole Johnson	
Lisa Liu	
Michael Lynch	
Brian Noguchi	
Sarah Smith	
Jennifer Wan	555-2947

